

respect I have for the Senator from Tennessee, for his commitment to public service, having been a very dedicated and now famous surgeon who uses his skills all over the world when we are not in session.

I apologize, and I have done it publicly on two occasions, for using that choice of words. It showed my frustration as to what had gone on here. There is no need to talk about it now other than to say that hopefully Wednesday we can move on to bigger and better things.

Madam President, I appreciate everyone's patience and courtesy to me today. I especially apologize to the staff for keeping them as long as I have. I hope that I have been of some benefit to my friends on this side of the aisle. I hope I have not been too offensive to those on this side of the aisle.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, with the concurrence of the distinguished majority leader, let me say that the majority leader, of course, is a dear friend, but the senior Senator from Nevada has been a very dear friend for many, many years. We campaigned the same year, I for reelection, he for the Senate. I have always been very proud of him.

When historians look back, they will see he did a great service for the Senate today in trying to put a lot of things in perspective. I will speak longer at another time. I am doing this at the concurrence of the leader showing his usual courtesy. I will not exceed that. I will speak at a later time.

I appreciate my friend and also appreciate my friend from Tennessee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, I know Members have been wondering about the schedule. There will be no rollcall votes tonight. We were prepared to have votes throughout today and this evening, procedural or otherwise, but I think that will not serve any useful purpose at this late hour. The best course is probably to step back for the evening and begin fresh tomorrow, which we will do.

Today we were to begin considering a very important appropriations bill, Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill. As a matter of fact, that bill has been pending since shortly after 1 o'clock today. Unfortunately, we were able to make no progress on that bill today. That was successfully obstructed.

I indeed respect every Senator's right to do just that, and the distinguished minority whip was within his rights to hold the floor throughout the entire afternoon and this evening.

We were prepared to offer and vote in relation to amendments to the Commerce-Justice-State bill, but that was not possible. We were told last week

the other side of the aisle would not be offering their amendments today, on Monday. The two managers were working together to move forward on amendments that would be offered by Members on this side of the aisle today. Indeed, Republican Members were present today to offer and debate those amendments. I take it the other side of the aisle did not show up to do the Nation's business as it pertained to this Commerce-Justice-State bill.

I have stated repeatedly in the Senate that there is much, much work to do and that there is little time remaining to do it. Later this week, indeed, we will focus on judges as part of the unfinished business that remains before this body. I will continue to bring to the floor to the best of my ability each and every appropriations bill. If the other side of the aisle does not want to debate and discuss those bills as they are brought to the floor, that is their right.

Today our focus was on continuing the appropriations process. It is obvious that delay will occur on every front. Then, indeed, I think that is unfortunate given the amount of business we have to do.

I am sure that at some point in the future we will hear speeches about work that we did or did not get done or we were late in doing, and there will be Senators bemoaning the fact that the Senate has been unable to finish our business. Today was a missed opportunity to make progress on these important appropriations bills.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. I ask that there now be a period of morning business with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe one such crime that occurred in Greensburg, PA. Ian Bishop, 16, allegedly hated his 18-year old brother, Adam, because he thought he was gay. After beating his brother in the head at least 18 times with a claw hammer and wooden club, Ian dumped Adam's body in the bathtub, then went to a nearby shopping mall where he described the attack and laughed about his brother's death.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can

become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

INTERNET TAX NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise to speak to an amendment S. 150, the Internet Tax Non-Discrimination Act of 2003.

Over the past few weeks some have mischaracterized my position concerning the Internet tax moratorium and suggested that I supported taxing the Internet or, even more inaccurately, that I supported taxing e-mail.

Nothing could be further from the truth, and I welcome the opportunity to set the record straight on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I have never and will never support taxing e-mail. That's patently ridiculous.

On October 31, 2003, the Cincinnati Enquirer correctly reported my opposition on this very important issue:

Senator George Voinovich of Ohio has been boiled in a witches' cauldron this week by critics angered that he helped block an expanded ban of taxes on Internet services. The current Internet Tax Moratorium, which he supports, expires Saturday. Anti-tax groups making Voinovich out to be the devil incarnate are roasting the wrong guy. Voinovich favors keeping the tax moratorium on Internet access. He helped negotiate the Internet Tax Freedom Act of 1998, supported its renewal in 2001 and opposes new taxes on telecommunications services. And yes, he strongly opposes a tax on e-mail.

This newspaper and others like it in Ohio have captured the essence of my argument. The debate on S. 150 is not about taxing e-mail. This debate is about federalism, unfunded mandates, and protecting the States' rights to govern their own affairs.

To clarify my position, I will offer an amendment that expresses the sense of the Senate that e-mail should not now, nor in the future, be taxed by Federal, State, or local governments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SPECTER, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1156. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and enhance the provision of long-term health care for veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to enhance and improve authorities relating to the administration of personnel of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 108-193).

By Ms. COLLINS, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 3159. A bill to require Federal agencies to develop and implement plans to protect the security and privacy of government computer systems from the risks posed by peer-to-peer file sharing.